

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on August 3, 2009. Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 11, 12 and 14 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claim 14 has been added. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of Claim 8 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is respectfully requested that new Claim 14 is analogous to Claim 8 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, allowance of independent Claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Singh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,038). The rejection with respect to Claims 1-4, 11, and 12 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, recites, *inter alia*, as follows:

“...real-time rendering of non-contiguous segments of *the stream of video data* comprising multiple subsequent frames to a first rendered stream; non real-time rendering of *the stream of video data* by rendering pre-determined non subsequent frames to a second rendered stream...” (emphasis added)

As Claim 1 recites, that real-time rendering and non real-time rendering of the same stream of video data occurs. Singh et al. fails to disclose “...real-time rendering of non-contiguous segments of *the stream of video data* comprising multiple subsequent frames to a first rendered stream; non real-time rendering of *the stream of video data* by rendering pre-determined non subsequent frames to a second rendered stream,” as recited in by independent Claim 1.

Singh et al. discloses a television receiver that is capable of displaying two video programs corresponding to two different streams of video data, and an electronic program guide (“EPG”) simultaneously. The EPG is displayed in a first portion of a split screen containing a picture-in-picture (PIP) display. Scanning of the electronic program guide causes *different* video programs to be displayed in the PIP display while the user is still able to watch the original video program on a second split screen. (See Abstract) In other words, Singh et al. merely displays two video programs corresponding to two different streams of video data since they are different video programs. Thus, there can be no real-time rendering and non real-time rendering of the same stream of video data as required by Applicants’ Claim 1.

In contrast to the teachings of Singh et al., it is respectfully submitted that Applicants’ claimed subject matter provides that the same stream of video data is rendered in real-time and non real-time. This is clear from the claim language of Claim 1 which recites “a stream of video data” in the preamble and the body of the claim states “real-time rendering...of the stream of video data” and “non real-time rendering...of the stream of video data.” There is only one stream of video data.

As stated by Applicants in response to the previous Office Action, with Applicants’ claimed subject matter a viewer may view a program as it is broadcast in real-time and simultaneously (on the same screen in a separate window) rewind or fast-forward in non-real-time a second program, where the faster rate of viewing of the second program is displayed on the screen simultaneously with the first program. Thus, a first program can be viewed normally on a portion of a screen while the user performs any other type of ‘speedy’ operation on a second program. The ‘speedy’ operation on the second program is not performed in the background, but can be viewed in conjunction with the first program on the same screen (in a

new window). The first program and the second program are the same program rendered in real-time and non real-time, respectively.

Independent Claims 11 and 12 include the same or similar limitations to those of Claim 1, and are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) with respect to Claims 1, 11, and 12 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-4, are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) with respect to dependent Claims 2-4, and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh et al. in view of Crow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,665). The rejection with respect to Claims 5, 6, 9, and 10 is respectfully traversed.

Crow et al. does not address the deficiencies of Singh et al. with respect to independent Claim 1. Dependent Claims 5, 6, 9, and 10 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to dependent Claims 5, 6, 9, and 10 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all Claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14, are believed to be in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
Registration No. 43,600

Date: November 3, 2009

By:


George Likourezos
Reg. No. 40,067
Attorney for Applicants
631-501-5706

Mail all correspondence to:
Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618